

Submission of Replacement Drawings

Replacement drawing sheets are submitted herewith for Figs. 4, 5 and 10-13 so as to label each of Figs. 4, 5 and 10-13 as "Prior Art". In addition, in Fig. 10, "113" has been changed to --113a--. It is submitted that these drawing revisions overcome the objection to the drawings, and it is respectfully requested that these drawings be approved and entered into the application file.

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 10-18 have been cancelled, and claims 19-28 have been added. Thus, claims 19-28 are now active in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to make grammatical and idiomatic improvements in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. The amendments to the specification and abstract are incorporated in the attached substitute specification and abstract. No new matter has been added.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and Abstract by the current amendment. The attachment is captioned "**Version with markings to show changes made.**"

On page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because reference character "113" had been used to designate two different elements in the drawings, and because Figs. 4-6 and 10-13 should be labeled as "Prior Art". Accordingly, replacement drawing sheets are submitted herewith for Figs. 4, 5 and 10-13 so as to label each of Figs. 4, 5 and 10-13 as "Prior Art". In addition, in Fig. 10, "113" has been changed to --113a--. It is submitted that these drawing revisions overcome the objection to the drawings, and it is respectfully requested that these drawings be approved and entered into the application file.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 10, 11 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is believed moot in view of the cancellation of claims 10-18. Furthermore, new claims 19-28 have been drafted to avoid the problems noted by the Examiner and to otherwise clearly comport with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

On pages 4-8 of the Office Action, claims 10-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Applicant's own admissions; claims 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11-058584 (Nakamura); and claims 10-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kosaka et al. (U.S. 6,207,268). These rejections

are believed moot in view of the cancellation of claims 10-18. Furthermore, these rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to the new claims 19-28, for the following reasons.

With exemplary reference to the drawing figures, new claim 19 sets forth a transfer member 1 comprising: a substrate sheet 2; a mold release layer 3 laminated on the substrate sheet 2, the mold release layer 3 being constituted by a plurality of elongated mold release belt portions (see, for example, Figs. 1-3) separated from one another so that a space is defined between each adjacent pair of the mold release belt portions 3; an ionizing radiation curing layer 4 laminated all over the mold release layer 3, and all over the substrate sheet 2 in areas not covered by the mold release layer 3; a patterned layer 5 laminated on the ionizing radiation curing layer 4; and an adhesive layer 6 laminated on the patterned layer 5 in such a manner that the adhesive layer 6 is located on the patterned layer 5 only in areas that are superposed over the mold release belt portions 3 of the mold release layer 3, such that the adhesive layer 6 is not provided in areas not superposed over the mold release belt portions 3 of the mold release layer 3.

Thus, according to claim 19, and as illustrated in the drawing figures (for example, Figs. 1-3), the mold release layer 3 is provided in the form of plural elongated mold release belt portions which are separated from each other by spaces. This provides for the slit areas 8 in which the transfer member can be slit in the manner illustrated in prior art Fig. 12, but without the negative occurrence of the flakes 131 as illustrated in prior art Fig. 13. As also illustrated, for example, in Figs. 1-3, the adhesive layer 6 is provided on the patterned layer 5 only in areas that are superposed over the mold release belt portions 3 of the mold release layer 3, such that the adhesive layer 6 is not provided in areas that are not superposed over the mold release belt portions of the mold release layer 3. As described in the present specification at, for example, page 18, line 22 - page 19, line 3, the reason why the adhesive layer 6 is located “only in areas that are superposed over said mold release belt portions of said mold release layer” is that the substrate sheet 2 will not peel off the molding resin when the molding resin adheres.

In contrast to the present invention of claim 19, the admitted prior art described in the “Background Art” section of the present specification and illustrated in Figs. 4, 5 and 10-13 clearly does not include this combination of features as now recited in claim 19. For example, in the prior art shown in Fig. 4 of the present application, the adhesive layer 106 is laminated on the patterned layer 105 in such a manner that it is disposed both in areas superposed with the mold release layer 103 and in areas which are not superposed over the mold release layer 103. In the prior art illustrated in Fig. 5 of the present application, the mold release layer 103 is not constituted by a plurality of elongated mold release belt portions separated from one another so that a space is defined between each of adjacent pair of mold release belt portions, as required by claim 19.

In the Nakamura reference (JP 11-058584), Fig. 1 illustrates an arrangement wherein, although a layer 2 (referred to by the Examiner as a “mold release layer of a belt-shaped pattern”) is illustrated as having a space between two portions thereof, the layer 5 (referred to by the Examiner as “an adhesive layer”) covers an entirety of the layer 4 (referred to by the Examiner as a “patterned layer”). Therefore, the “adhesive layer” 5 of the Nakamura reference cannot be said to be laminated on the patterned layer in such a manner that the adhesive layer is located on the patterned layer only in areas that are superposed over the mold release belt portions of the mold release layer such that the adhesive layer is not provided in areas not superposed over the mold release belt portions of the mold release layers, as required by claim 19. That is, as clearly illustrated in, for example, Fig. 1 of the Nakamura reference, the adhesive layer 5 is clearly superposed over the portion labeled 1a where there is no “mold release layer” 2 disposed.

With reference to Fig. 21 of the Kosaka et al. patent, it can also be clearly seen that the Kosaka et al. patent does not disclose or suggest the present invention as now recited in claim 19. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 21, although the layer 18 (referred to by the Examiner as the “mold release layer”) is provided in spaced apart portions having spaces therebetween, there is no showing of an adhesive layer that is disposed to be laminated on a “patterned layer” so as to be provided only in areas superposed over the “mold release layer” portions 18 and not provided in

areas that are not superposed over the belt portions of the mold release layer 18. In the rejection, the Examiner indicated that the claimed “adhesive layer” was met by

“... an adhesive layer (disposed between primer 12a and protective layer 13 (functioning as nonadhesive as it’s protective, not of adhesive material and does not overlap with mold release because it’s not adjacent to it), referring to the thirteenth transfer sheet as FIG. 21 (29:32-65) laminated on the patterned layer, so as not to locate at a region where the mold release layer is not formed, only partially in a portion where the adhesive layer overlaps with the mold release layer.”

Although this indication by the Examiner could not be fully understood, it would appear that the Examiner was somehow insinuating that, for two layers to “overlap”, they must be adjacent to one another. This interpretation of the word “overlap” is clearly contrary to the manner in which the term is used consistently through the present specification with reference to the present drawings. However, in order to clarify the matter, the claims now use the term “superposed over”, which is intended to mean overlapping but not necessarily adjacent to one another.

Thus, for the above reasons, it is believed apparent that claim 19 is not anticipated by any of the admitted prior art described in the present application, the Nakamura reference or the Kosaka et al. reference. The disclosures of these references are clearly such that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have found it obvious to modify the structures disclosed therein or to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in or otherwise render obvious the present invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that, for the reasons presented above, the present independent claim 19, as well as the claims 20-23 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

The independent claim 24 is directed to a transfer member arrangement comprising a resin board, and a transfer member bonded to the resin board (e.g., 144), wherein the transfer member is required to include all of the same features as required by claim 19. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claim 24, as well as claims 25-28 which depend therefrom, are clearly


allowable over the prior art of record for the same reasons as set forth above in support of claim 19.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiyohito SHIGEMURA

By: 

Charles R. Watts

Registration No. 33,142

Attorney for Applicant

CRW/asd
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 14, 2008